

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
1.0 SUMMARY .....	1 1/A5
2.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1 1/A5
2.1 Scope of the Project .....	1 1/A5
3.0 DESIGN STUDY OF THE 186 kW ENGINE .....	1 1/A5
3.1 Engine Features .....	1 1/A5
3.2 Engine Concept Design .....	3 1/A8
3.3 Gross Power Requirements .....	3 1/A8
3.4 Cylinder Configuration .....	9 1/B2
3.5 Engine Operating Data .....	9 1/B2
3.6 p-V Diagrams .....	11 1/B4
3.7 Turbocharger Operation .....	13 1/B6
3.8 Weight and Initial Cost .....	18 1/B14
4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM .....	19 1/C1
5.0 CONCLUSIONS .....	20 1/C2

MAY 12 1980

NAS 32613261

COMPLETED

ORIGINAL

NASA Contractor Report 3261

# 186 kW Lightweight Diesel Aircraft Engine Design Study

Alex P. Brouwers

CONTRACT NAS3-20830  
APRIL 1980

**NASA**

NASA Contractor Report 3261

# 186 kW Lightweight Diesel Aircraft Engine Design Study

Alex P. Brouwers  
*Teledyne Continental Motors*  
*Muskegon, Michigan*

Prepared for  
Lewis Research Center  
under Contract NAS3-20830



National Aeronautics  
and Space Administration

**Scientific and Technical  
Information Office**

1980

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
1.0 SUMMARY .....	1
2.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.1 Scope of the Project .....	1
3.0 DESIGN STUDY OF THE 186 kW ENGINE .....	1
3.1 Engine Features .....	1
3.2 Engine Concept Design .....	3
3.3 Gross Power Requirements .....	3
3.4 Cylinder Configuration .....	9
3.5 Engine Operating Data .....	9
3.6 p-V Diagrams .....	11
3.7 Turbocharger Operation .....	13
3.8 Weight and Initial Cost .....	18
4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM .....	19
5.0 CONCLUSIONS .....	20

## **1.0 SUMMARY**

This report describes the design of an aircraft diesel engine capable of developing 186 kW net power at 7620m altitude, utilizing the experience gained from the basic study of the 300 kW and 150 kW aircraft diesel engines. It was conducted as an extension of the original study and compliments that work. The 186 kW design takes expected new developments in aircraft design into account, resulting in a reassessment of the power requirement at the cruise mode of operation.

Based on the results of this analysis, it is possible to project a development program in three phases, resulting in production dates in 1985, 1992 and 2000. The advantages of this approach are:

- A fuel efficient engine will become available at the earliest possible date.
- It results in a gradual, stepwise development of the ultimate power plant.
- It will be possible to retrofit each new version on then existing aircraft. Also, it will be possible to retrofit newly developed components on previous versions of the diesel aircraft engine.

This report follows the format and arrangement of the final report on the original two engines.

## **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

Programs are currently being defined at NASA that are keyed toward improved fuel efficiency of general aviation aircraft. In addition to more efficient power plants, which this study addresses, these programs involve new propeller technology, improved aerodynamics and weight reduction of aircraft through the use of composites. The projected aircraft performance improvements have led to a re-definition of the engine power requirements.

### **2.1 Scope of the Project**

The purpose of this study is the conceptual design of an advanced diesel aircraft engine capable of sustained 186 kW net cruise power at 7620m altitude. The engine will be suitable to power high performance pressurized single and pressurized twin engine aircraft. The level of technology must be such that the engine can be commercially introduced in the late 1980's.

## **3.0 DESIGN STUDY OF THE 186 kW ENGINE**

Figure 3-1 shows the schematic of the engine.

### **3.1 Engine Features**

The design incorporates the following features, most of which have been discussed earlier in the main report.

1. Radial cylinder configuration.
2. Two-stroke cycle, Curtis loop scavenged.
3. Limited cooling of the cylinders within the limitations of conventional materials.
4. Turbocharged and aftercooled.




FIGURE 3-1 SCHEMATIC 2-STROKE ENGINE WITH INDEPENDENT TURBO LOOP, REDUCED CYLINDER COOLING, LOW COMPRESSION RATIO.

5. Independent turbocharger loop. This is similar to the previously described 6-cylinder 300 kW engine and eliminates the need for a centrifugal blower.
6. Conventional combustor in the exhaust manifold. The catalytic combustor will be developed for a later production version of the engine.
7. High speed starter/alternator.
8. Bleed air starter.
9. Geared propeller drive.
10. Separate injection pumps for each cylinder.

### 3.2 Engine Concept Design

The engine concept design is shown in the Figures 3-2 through 3-6. The cylinders are arranged in one bank of four cylinders. The cylinders have a limited number of cooling fins to cool the combustion chamber. The cylinders are held down by means of threaded and toothed rings. This method results in a uniform load on the cylinder mounting flanges and eliminates the current problem of cylinder bore distortion. The intake manifold is located at the front side of the engine. Two elbows per cylinder direct the air to the intake ports. Two exhaust manifolds at the back side of the cylinders are provided to avoid pulse interference between the cylinders. The connecting rods are designed as slipper rods.

The use of synthetic oil is not contemplated because of relatively low cylinder temperatures. The turbocharger is mounted behind the engine as are the oil cooler and the aftercooler. A conventional combustor and igniter are mounted to the exhaust manifold to provide the independent turbocharger loop feature. A propeller reduction gear is provided to combine a low propeller speed and a high engine RPM.

The Figures 3-2 through 3-6 show the engine configurations for twin engine aircraft and single engine aircraft with a fixed landing gear. Another version, not shown, will have the coolers moved outboard to provide space for a retractable nose gear.

### 3.3 Gross Power Requirements

The net shaft power requirement (input into the propeller) at cruise condition is 186.4 kW at 7620m altitude. An 85% propeller efficiency results in 158.4 kW propulsive power.

Power demand of the accessories:

#### 1. Injection Pump

- Fuel flow approximately 45 kg/hr
- Pump pressure 82,750 kPa
- Pump efficiency 75%
- Pump power 2.31 kW

#### 2. Alternator

- 24V, 100A, 65% efficiency
- Input power 3.73 kW





FIGURE 3-2 186 kW AIRCRAFT DIESEL LONGITUDINAL SECTION





**FIGURE 3-3 186 kW AIRCRAFT DIESEL CROSS SECTION**




FIGURE 3-4 186 kW AIRCRAFT DIESEL FRONT VIEW




FIGURE 3-5 195 kW AIRCRAFT DIESEL SIDE VIEW




FIGURE 3-6 186kW AIRCRAFT DIESEL REAR VIEW

### **3. Cabin Air Pressurization**

- Cabin air will be supplied by a mechanical blower. Power requirement of the blower is 7.46 kW per engine.

### **4. Oil Pump**

- Specific flow rate— $.228 \text{ l/min/kW}$
- Flow rate— $.635 \text{ kg/sec}$
- Oil Pressure— $310 \text{ kPa}$
- Pump efficiency— $60\%$
- Power input— $.37 \text{ kW}$

### **5. Remaining Accessories— $.30 \text{ kW}$**

### **6. Total all accessories— $14.20 \text{ kW}$**

Gross engine power demand at altitude is  $186.4 + 14.2 = 200.6 \text{ kW}$ .

### **3.4 Cylinder Configuration**

Based on experience gained in the design of the 150 kW and 300 kW engines, it was decided to design a geared 4-cylinder engine.

1. The cylinders of a 4-cylinder engine are larger than those of a 6-cylinder engine, but elimination of 2-cylinders and moving parts, coupled with a shorter crankshaft and a shorter crankcase results in a lighter engine.
2. Fewer parts of a 4-cylinder configuration results in improved reliability.
3. The 4-cylinder configuration adapts easier to a single engine aircraft with retractable nose gear.

### **3.5 Engine Operating Data**

The engine data for three flight conditions are shown in Table I.

**TABLE I**  
**Operating Parameters**

	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
Altitude	0	7,620	7,620	meters
Power	275.2	200.6	135.3	kW
RPM	3500	3500	2650	
Displacement	4.031	4.031	4.031	liters
Bore x Stroke	108 x 110	108 x 110	108 x 110	mm
BMEP	1170	853	761	kPa
Compressor Pressure Ratio	3.706:1	7.250:1	6.918:1	
Nominal Compression Ratio	13.37:1	13.37:1	13.37:1	
Effective Compression Ratio	10.0:1	10.0:1	10.0:1	
Barometric Pressure	101.4	37.65	37.65	kPa
Ambient Temperature	15.5	-34.4	-34.4	°C
Intake Manifold Pressure	366.3	261.5	252.9	kPa
Intake Manifold Temperature	115.6	115.6	115.6	°C
Exhaust Manifold Pressure	293.1	209.2	226.8	kPa
Ratio $\frac{\text{Int. Press.}}{\text{Exh. Press.}}$	1.250	1.250	1.115	
Scavenge System	Curtis Loop	Curtis Loop	Curtis Loop	
Scavenge Ratio	1.3	1.3	1.3	
Height Intake Ports	21	21	21	mm
Height Exhaust Ports	30	30	30	mm
Intake Ports Open/Close	59°23'	59°23'	59°23'	
Exh. Ports Open/Close	71°10'	71°10'	71°10'	
BSFC	219.0	225.1	206.8	g/kW-hr
Fuel Flow	60.26	45.15	27.99	kg/hr

	Take-Off 82	Cruise 82	Economy Cruise 82	
Scavenge Efficiency				percent
Air Density at Exhaust Port Closing	.00272	.00194	.00203	kg/l
Volume of Pure Air Per Cycle	.668	.668	.668	l
Weight of Pure Air Per Cycle	.00181	.00130	.00136	kg
Air/Fuel Ratio	25.00	24.14	30.00	

### 3.6 P-V Diagrams

Specific data points for the three conditions are given in Table II.

**TABLE II**  
**Air Cycle Performance**

	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
P <sub>1</sub>	330	235	240	kPa
V <sub>1</sub>	.814	.814	.814	liter
T <sub>1</sub>	149	149	138	°C
P <sub>2</sub>	7729	5516	5626	kPa
V <sub>2</sub>	.081	.081	.081	liter
T <sub>2</sub>	717	717	691	°C
P <sub>3</sub>	8846	6633	6743	kPa
V <sub>3</sub>	.081	.081	.081	liter
T <sub>3</sub>	860	917	882	°C
P <sub>4</sub>	8846	6633	6743	kPa
V <sub>4</sub>	.156	.154	.140	liter
T <sub>4</sub>	1902	1976	1718	°C
P <sub>5</sub>	1061	780	705	kPa
V <sub>5</sub>	.814	.814	.814	liter
T <sub>5</sub>	1085	1126	934	°C

	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
Coefficient of Compression	1.370	1.370	1.370	
Coefficient of Expansion	1.285	1.285	1.285	
Fuel/Cyl/Rev.	.0000726	.0000544	.0000454	kg
Q/Cyl/Rev.	.744	.558	.465	kcal
Q <sub>1</sub>	.067	.067	.067	kcal
Q <sub>2</sub>	.677	.491	.398	kcal
IMEP	1496	1126	988	kPa
Mech. Efficiency	78.2	75.8	77.0	Percent
Comp. Press. Ratio	3.706	7.250	6.918	
Comp. Inlet Temp.	+ 15.5	-34.4	-34.4	°C
Weight Pure Air	.423	.303	.241	kg/sec
Weight Scavenge Air	.127	.090	.072	kg/sec
Comp. Airflow	.550	.393	.313	kg/sec
Fuel Flow	.017	.013	.008	kg/sec
Weight Exh. Gas	.440	.315	.248	kg/sec
Blowdown Temp. Exh. Gas	712	734	636	°C
Turbine Inlet Temp.	586	603	524	°C
<b>Turbo Efficiencies</b>				
Comp. $\eta_{ac}$	.78	.77	.78	
Turbine $\eta_{at/t-s}$	.77	.76	.77	
Compressor $\eta_{pc}$	.816	.823	.830	
Turbine $\eta_{pt}$	.745	.718	.727	
Mechanical	.98	.98	.98	
Overall $\eta$ (= $\eta_{pc} \times \eta_{pt} \times \eta_m$ )	.596	.579	.591	
$\sqrt{s}$	.772	.761	.769	
Turbine Press. Ratio	2.890	5.557	6.026	
Comp. Inlet Temp.	+ 15.5	-34.4	-34.4	°C



	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
Required TIT	580	557	481	°C
Available TIT	586	603	524	°C

The figures 3-7 through 3-9 show the schematics of these three operating conditions.

### 3.7 Turbocharger Operation

The turbocharger data for the 3 modes of operation are shown in Table III.

The results of the calculations indicate a requirement for a variable turbine nozzle area. A 2-position nozzle setting may be possible which would greatly simplify the control system.

**TABLE III**  
**Turbocharger Data**

	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
Comp. Press. Ratio	3.706	7.250	6.918	
Turb. Press. Ratio	2.890	5.557	6.026	
Efficiencies	See Table II			
Comp. Airflow	.550	.393	.313	kg/sec
Comp. Inlet Temp.	15.5	-34.4	-34.4	°C
Comp. Discharge Temp.	182.0	199.3	189.3	°C
Intake Manifold Temp.	115.9	115.9	115.9	°C
Aftercooler Heat Load	530.5	477.8	334.2	kcal/min
Comp. Input Power	93.0	93.3	71.0	kW
Bearing Loss	1.8	1.9	1.4	kW
Required Turbine Output Power	94.8	95.2	72.4	kW
Available Turbine Inlet Temp.	586.0	603.2	523.7	°C
Exhaust Gas Flow	.567	.406	.320	kg/sec
C <sub>pt</sub>	.266	.266	.262	kcal/kg-°C
k	1.346	1.346	1.354	
Available Turbine Shaft Power	99.7	107.3	88.0	kW
$\phi/\phi_0$	.988	1 (Design Point)	.752	
Exhaust Energy Factor	.051	.105	.057	

	Take-Off	Cruise	Economy Cruise	
$P_{rt-t}$	2.80	5.00	5.82	
Turbine Inlet Pressure	293.1	209.2	226.8	kPa
Turbine Outlet Pressure	104.5	41.9	39.0	kPa
Temp. Drop in Turbine	157.8	237.2	229.5	°C
Turbine Discharge Temp.	428.2	365.9	294.3	°C
Exducer Diameter	115	115	115	mm
Exducer Flow Area	75.0	75.0	75.0	cm <sup>2</sup>
Area Ratio $A/A^*$	2.095	1.257	1.54	
Exit Mach Number	.284	.551	.420	
Stagnation Temp.	418.7	334.3	277.0	°C
Gas velocity into Rotor	677.3	825.4	821.1	m/sec
Gas Velocity out of Rotor	146.0	265.5	192.6	m/sec

Preferable Exit Velocity is 1.25—1.50 Times Air Speed.

Turbine Rotor Diameter	152	152	152	mm
Comp. Wheel Diameter	158	158	158	mm
Comp. Tip Speed	457.8	543.8	531.9	m/sec
Comp. Speed $\sqrt{\theta_c}$	55343	65734	64297	rpm
Comp. Inlet Temp.	+15.5	-34.4	-34.4	°C
$\sqrt{\theta_c}$	.977	.888	.888	
Comp. Speed N	54070	58372	57096	rpm
Temp. Correction Factor $\theta_t$	2.84	2.89	2.63	
Press. Correction Factor $\delta_t$	2.89	2.06	2.24	
Corrected Turbine Mass Flow	.331	.225	.155	kg/sec
Nozzle Area	15.29	14.85	10.21	cm <sup>2</sup>




FIGURE 3-7 OPERATING SCHEMATIC—TAKE-OFF




FIGURE 3-8 OPERATING SCHEMATIC—CRUISE POWER




FIGURE 3-9 OPERATING SCHEMATIC—ECONOMY CRUISE POWER

### 3.8 Weight and Initial Cost

The weight of the engine and the cost relative to a current gasoline aircraft engine are shown in Table IV.

**TABLE IV**  
**Weight and Cost of the 186 kW Diesel**

	<b>A</b> TECHNOLOGY AND/OR MATERIAL FACTOR	<b>B</b> WEIGHT kg	<b>A X B</b> EVALUATION NUMBER
Proper Gear Housing	1.00	14.80	14.80
Crankshaft	1.00	9.37	9.37
Counterweights	2.00	4.56	9.12
Prop Drive Gears	1.00	9.07	9.07
Crankcase Assembly	1.00	5.44	5.44
Accessory Housing	1.00	3.96	3.96
Accessory Drive Gears	1.00	4.00	4.00
Pistons	1.25	3.34	4.17
Connecting Rods	1.50	3.08	4.62
Piston Rings	2.00	.24	.48
Cylinders	1.50	31.75	47.62
Injection System	2.50	4.08	10.20
Intake System	1.00	9.53	9.53
Exhaust System	1.00	.66	.66
Combustor	1.25	.78	.97
Fuel Pump	1.00	1.16	1.16
Governor	1.00	.91	.91
Vacuum Pump	1.00	.91	.91
Oil Pump	1.00	5.95	5.95
Starter / Generator	2.50	6.37	15.92
Oil Cooler	1.00	2.63	2.63
Aftercooler	1.00	4.08	4.08
Turbocharger	1.75	20.41	35.71
Balance Engine Parts	1.00	<u>27.22</u>	<u>27.22</u>
		174.30	228.50

1. Weight Factor:

Weight diesel 174.30 kg

Weight Gasoline Engine 254.90 kg

$$\text{Weight Ratio } \frac{174.30}{254.90} = .684$$

2. Overall Engine Technology and Material Factor:

$$\frac{\text{Total A\&B}}{\text{Total B}} = \frac{228.50}{174.30} = 1.311$$

3. Overall Cost Ratio Diesel Versus Current Gasoline Engine:

$$.684 \times 1.311 = .896$$

**Two observations can be made:**

1. The weight ratio of the 6-cylinder diesel was .791 (Page 71 Final Report). The 4-cylinder configuration, therefore, has resulted in a sizeable weight reduction compared to a 6-cylinder engine of the same displacement.
2. The same applies to engine costs. The 4-cylinder configuration costs 10% less than a current gasoline engine of the same power. A 6-cylinder configuration would have cost more than a current gasoline engine.

**4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

The projected 1985 production date of the 186 kW engine puts limitations on the technologies that can be developed within this time frame. Development of uncooled cylinders, the catalytic combustor and very high compressor pressure ratios requires much more time. Consequently, the program has been revised to result in three production release dates.

Table V lists the technologies and performance targets of the three versions of the aircraft diesel.

**TABLE V**  
**Features and Performance Targets of the Aircraft Diesel Development Program**

	PROJECTED PRODUCTION RELEASE DATES		
	1985	1992	2000
Features			
	Radial	Radial	Radial
	2-Stroke Cycle	2-Stroke Cycle	2-Stroke Cycle
	Limited Cooling (conventional materials)	Limited Cooling (high temperature materials)	No Cylinder Cooling (Ceramics)
	Turbocharged $P_{rc} = 7.25:1$	Turbocharged $P_{rc} = 9.00:1$	Turbocharged and Turbocompounded
	Conventional Lubrication	Air Bearings	Air Bearings

	1985	1992	2000	
Displacement	4.031	4.031	4.031	ℓ
RPM	3500	3500	3500	
Net Cruise Power at 7,620m Altitude	186	257	298	kW
Cruise BSFC	225	197	170	g/kW-hr
Net Take-Off Power	268	369	428	kW
Take-Off BSFC	219			g /kW-hr
Net Economy Power (65% of Cruise Power)	121	167	193	kW
Economy BSFC	206			g/kW-hr
Dry Weight (Including Accessories)	174	186	198	kg
Spec. Weight Based on Cruise Power	.935	.726	.664	kg/kW
Spec. Weight Based on Take-Off Power	.649	.506	.462	kg/kW

The phased development approach has several advantages:

1. A fuel efficient engine will be commercially available at an early date.
2. Fewer technologies will be addressed for each version, which enhances the success of the program.
3. Each successive version can be retrofitted on older aircraft and thus improve the performance of the aircraft.
4. it will be possible to rebuild older engine versions to incorporate the technologies of the next generation.

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS


1. The 4-cylinder configuration, although somewhat larger in diameter, offers a distinct weight and cost advantage over a 6-cylinder engine of the same displacement. The radial engine should be designed for a minimum number of cylinders within the available space.
2. The phased development program offers several advantages.
  - A fuel-efficient production engine will be come available much sooner.
  - Fewer technologies need to be developed during each phase thus reducing the risks of the development program.



1. Report No. <b>NASA CR-3261</b>	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle <b>186 kW LIGHTWEIGHT DIESEL AIRCRAFT ENGINE DESIGN STUDY</b>		5. Report Date <b>April 1980</b>	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) <b>Alex P. Brouwers</b>		8. Performing Organization Report No. <b>756</b>	
		10. Work Unit No.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address <b>Teledyne Continental Motors 76 Getty Street Muskegon, Michigan 49442</b>		11. Contract or Grant No. <b>NAS3-20830</b>	
		13. Type of Report and Period Covered <b>Contractor Report</b>	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address <b>National Aeronautics and Space Administration Washington, D.C. 20546</b>		14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes <b>Final report. Project Manager, Lloyd W. Ream, Engine Systems Division, NASA Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio 44135.</b>			
16. Abstract <p>The study presented in this report is a continuation and augmentation of the program described in NASA CR-3260, 150 and 300 kW Lightweight Diesel Aircraft Engine Design Study. This report describes the design of an aircraft engine capable of developing 186 kW shaft power at a 7620 m altitude. The 186 kW design takes into account expected new developments in aircraft designs resulting in a reassessment of the power requirements at the cruise mode operation. Based on the results of this analysis a three phase technology development program is projected resulting in production dates of 1985, 1992, and 2000.</p>			
17. Key Words (Suggested by Author(s)) <b>Aircraft diesel engine; Diesel aircraft engine; Advanced engines; Adiabatic diesel engine; Diesel with independent turbocharger loop; High speed starter/alternator for aircraft diesel; Two-stroke cycle aircraft diesel; Radial diesel aircraft engine</b>		18. Distribution Statement <b>Unclassified - unlimited STAR Category 07</b>	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) <b>Unclassified</b>	20. Security Classif. (of this page) <b>Unclassified</b>	21. No. of Pages <b>23</b>	22. Price* <b>A02</b>

\* For sale by the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161

NASA-Langley, 1980



**END**

*July 29, 1981*